REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the final Office Action mailed on September 29, 2008. No new matter is added. Claims 10-17 are pending.

Examiner Interview:

Applicants thank the Examiner, Ms. Anna Cheng Deng, for the telephonic interview that took place on January 23, 2009 with the Applicants' representatives James Larson and Amol Kavathekar. In the interview, Applicant's representatives introduced possible claim amendments to claim 10-16 in order to overcome the §101 rejection. In particular, Applicant's representatives proposed amending the preamble of claim 10 to recite "A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a tool for building an information system". The Examiner agreed that this would overcome the rejection if the specification made no reference to varying signals or waves.

Claim 10 is amended herein consistent with the discussion with the Examiner. The amendment should be entered because a computer-readable medium was previously recited in claim 17. Therefore, the amendment would not require further consideration or search.

Applicant's representatives also discussed with the Examiner the §102 rejection to claims 10-14, 16 and 18. Applicant's representatives argued that Turner does not disclose or suggest that after the information system is assembled, the information system is modifiable or expandable by one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views without any down time. No consensus was reached regarding this point.

§101 Rejections:

Claims 10-16 are rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is traversed. Claim 10 is amended to be directed to a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a tool for building an information system. Accordingly, claims 10-16 are now directed to statutory subject matter and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

§102 Rejections:

Claims 10-14, 16 and 17 are rejected as being anticipated by Turner (US Patent No. 6,230,309). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 10 is directed to a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a tool for building an information system. The tool requires, among other features, a builder component and an executor engine. The builder component receives one or more transaction structures and one or more information views that form a business process, and creates a plurality of definitions using the one or more transaction structures and the one or more information views. The executor engine uses the plurality of definitions created by the builder component to assemble the information system at run time. Also, claim 10 requires that after the information system is assembled, the information system is modifiable or expandable by one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views without any down time.

Turner does not disclose or suggest these features. In particular, nowhere does Turner disclose or suggest that after the information system is assembled, the information system is modifiable or expandable by one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views without any down time. As required by claim 10, transaction structures and information views form a business process and are used by the builder component to create a plurality of definitions which are then used to assemble the information system at runtime.

Turner is directed to a method and system for assembling and utilizing components in object systems that includes a design tool and a runtime tool. The design tool uses inputted user declarations to assemble component objects to form an object-based computer system application. The design tool includes a declarative user input interface mechanism and a design engine. The declarative user input interface mechanism allows a user to input user declarations that specify operative interaction between component objects. The design engine, in response to input user declarations, generates an application design definition that models an application infrastructure for managing component object interactions (see column 4, lines 41-51 of Turner).

The runtime tool is configured to interpret the application design definition to generate application view instances for managing runtime component object interactions. The runtime tool includes an application engine that is configured to create application view instances from respective application view definitions for managing runtime component object interactions for the application (see column 5, lines 26-43).

Thus, the design tool of Turner allows a user to input user declarations for building an application infrastructure made up of component objects and the runtime tool of Turner allows a user, once the application infrastructure is built, to input data values to manage the interaction between component objects.

The rejection relies on Figure 7B and column 15, lines 12-38 of Turner as disclosing that after the information system is assembled, the information system is modifiable or expandable by one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views without any down time. Figure 7B of Turner is a portion of a schematic block diagram of a general example of an Application Design model that shows an Application View Design area 42 that covers the entity types used to hold the definition of Application Views, a Component Description 44 that covers the features of components exploited by Application Views, and a Runtime Data Management area 46 that describes the objects which hold actual instances of Application Views. However, nowhere does Figure 7B or the other portions of the Application Design model shown in Figures 7A and 7C of Turner disclose or suggest that after the information system is assembled, the information system is modifiable or expandable by one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views (which are used to create a plurality of definitions that assemble an information system) without any down time.

Column 15, lines 12-38 discloses a Detail Operation Effect 68 that causes information about a current row in an Application View 80 to be refreshed or expanded by input values and an Update Operation Effect 68 that causes values in a current view in the Application View 80 to be updated by input values. Thus, this portion of Turner merely describes how data values inputted after the application is assembled are managed by specific component objects of the application that are arranged within an assembled application infrastructure, and does not suggest that the data values inputted after the

application is built are used to modify or expand the application infrastructure. Thus, nowhere does this portion of Turner disclose or suggest that after an application is assembled, the application is modifiable or expandable by one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more information views (which are used to assemble the application) without any downtime, as required by claim 10.

For at least these reasons claim 10 is not suggested by Turner and should be allowed. Claims 11-14 and 16 depend from claim 10 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

Claim 17 is directed to a method for building an information system onto a computer-readable medium that requires, inter alia, creating a plurality of definitions with a builder that uses one or more transaction structures and one or more information views that form a business process. Claim 17 also requires assembling the information system with an executor engine that uses the plurality of definitions created by the builder to assemble the information system at run time. Claim 17 further requires modifying and expanding the information system if one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views are received by the builder.

Turner does not disclose or suggest these features. As discussed above, with respect to claim 10, Turner is directed to a design tool and a runtime tool that does not disclose or suggest that after an information system is assembled, the information system is modifiable or expandable by one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views without any down time. Similarly, Turner also does not disclose or suggest modifying and expanding the information system if one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views are received by the builder without any downtime, as required by claim 17. For at least these reasons claim 17 is not suggested by Turner and should be allowed.

§103 Rejections:

Claim 15 is rejected as being unpatentable over Turner in view of Goodwin (US Patent No. 6,199,195). This rejection is traversed. As claim 15 depends from claim 1,

claim 15 should be allowed for at least the same reasons described above. Applicants do not concede the correctness of this rejection.

Conclusion:

Applicants respectfully assert that claims 10-17 are in condition for allowance. If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicants' primary attorney-of record, Michael D. Schumann (Reg. No. 30,422), at (612) 455-3803.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

Dated: January 29, 2009

By: _____
Michael D. Schumann
Reg. No. 30,422
MDS/ahk